

O P E



S/N: 09/964,973

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Burrell, et al. Examiner: Gerald O'Connor
Serial No.: 09/964,973 Group Art Unit: 3627
Filed: September 27, 2001 Docket No.: 60027.0050US01/BS01094
Title: Inventory Record Reconciliation

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on March 10, 2006.


By: Devon K. Grant

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES AND RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

In response to the election of species requirement and the restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action dated January 19, 2006 (Paper No. 2006112), Applicants hereby provisionally elect species II, claims 11-17 and 22 being readable thereon, drawn to a system for reconciling a current inventory record having counts, pricing and vintaging for a plurality of product types, for continued examination with traverse.

The Examiner has required restriction between species 1, drawn to a computer-implemented method of reconciling a current inventory having counts, pricing and vintaging for

a plurality of product types, claims 1-10 and 21 and species 2, drawn to a system for reconciling a current inventory record having counts, pricing and vintaging for a plurality of product types, claims 11-17 and 22. Further, the Examiner states that the subject application contains claims directed to two patentably distinct inventions as follows:

Group I, Claims 1-10 and 21 drawn to a method of business or management comprising generic or non-electrical computing;

Group II, Claims 11-17 and 22 drawn to a system for automated financial, business, or management practice comprising an arrangement for inventory management.

Applicants respectfully submit that at least claims 1-17, 21 and 22 are so closely related to each other, they would not be a serious burden for the Examiner to examine all of the claims at this time. For example, claims 1-10 and 21 are drawn to a computer-implemented method of reconciling a current inventory, and claims 11-17 and 22 are drawn to a system for implementing the a computer-implemented method of claims 1-10 and 21.

M.P.E.P. § 803 directs as follows: "If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine the application of the merits, even though it includes claims distinct or independent inventions." Applicants respectfully request that this directive be followed by the Examiner in this case at least with respect to claims 1-17, 21 and 22.

A one-month extension of time is requested for the period February 19, 2006 through March 19, 2006. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Date: March 10, 2006



Devon K. Grant
Reg. No. 57,036

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

